

Request for Validation of USG Unique E-Gov Standard

Submit to: NIST

Section 1

Summary Information

Date of Submission: November 13, 2007

E-Gov Initiative or LOB: Enterprise Human Resources Integration (EHRI) and Human Resources LOB

E-Gov Initiative or LOB Standards Validation Point of Contact:
Matthew Perry, OPM, matthew.peery@opm.gov, 202-606-1416 (EHRI)
Joe Campbell, OPM, Joseph.campbell@opm.gov, 202-606-1534 (HR)

Point of Contact for Submission (if different from above): same as above

Name of Standard: Guide to Human Resources Reporting - Version 3.4 dated August 11, 2006

Source for Standard: <http://opm.gov/feddata/ghrr/index.asp>

Purpose of Standard: This standard is designed to help Federal agencies prepare human resources (HR), payroll and training data files. Agencies are responsible for regularly submitting the data files to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). OPM then loads the data into its Enterprise Human Resources Integration (EHRI) data repository.

Chapters 2 thru 6, and appendices A thru D, contain information on the file structure for the three data files (HR, payroll, and training) and provide clear instructions for transferring those files to OPM. Essentially, this guide is an Interface Control Document (ICD) -- a source for the HR, payroll, and training data requirements and for methods of correcting data exceptions (i.e., errors) in those files.

The guide's other purpose is to record OPM's response to new policy demands for HR data. For instance, new policy on replacing the General Schedule with pay bands attached to jobs grouped by occupation and skill level may call for OPM to collect new HR data. A "Revision Sheet," found at the beginning of each chapter, will record how OPM responded to a policy change. It will be used to log revisions to a chapter, and it will have an "effective date" plus a "description" of the revision. Revision sheets are significant because they can be used to manage institutional knowledge of HR data requirements over time.

Section 2

Responses to Validation Questions

Title:

Does the title clearly and adequately describe the standard? [Yes](#)

Scope:

Is the scope clearly defined? [Yes](#)

Is it clear what is within and not within the scope of the standard? [Yes](#)

Is the purpose and need (e.g., security, interoperability) clearly stated? [Yes](#)

Is there adequate justification for why this standard is needed? [Yes](#)

Applicability and intended uses of standard:

Is it clear who should use the standard and for what applications? [Yes](#)

Description of relationship to existing standards if applicable:

If there are related standards, are they identified and the relationship explained?

The Human Resources Line of Business (HR LOB) Program Office establishes architecture standards for the HR LOB. The HR LOB Program has addressed four out of five Enterprise Architecture components described in OMB's Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) guidelines:

- The **Business Reference Model** (BRM) provides an end-to-end view of the Federal HR process, modeled to the activity level of detail. BRM version 1 was published in December 2004, and version 2 was published in January 2006.
- The **Data Reference Model** (DRM) depicts data at the conceptual and logical level. The conceptual DRM provides a high level view of all the data needed to perform BRM activities. The logical DRM provides a more detailed view (to the data element level of detail) of the data that is shared across Federal agencies and HR LOB shared service centers. The DRM was published in February 2006.
- The **Performance Reference Model** (PRM) identifies a common set of performance measures to be used throughout the Federal government along with a framework that links the measures to human capital strategic outcomes and agency mission results. PRM version 1 was published in June 2006.
- The **Service Component Reference Model** (SRM) provides a products and services view of the HR LOB BRM, a service delivery framework that proposes the channels to be used for delivering services to customers and a view of the technology required to enable those services. SRM version 1 was published in September 2006.

Description of the development process:

Is there a brief description that adequately describes the process by which the standard was developed (including meetings held, participants, etc.)?

Standards were developed in the following way:

- Standards were developed by interagency working groups.
- Interagency work groups identified all forms necessary to protect the rights and benefits of an employee. Once these forms were collected, the workgroup identified every data element on these forms to determine data was needed.
- The interagency work group also identified all standard reporting and ad hoc reports that had to be provided to OPM or other oversight agencies to determine what data was needed.
- Once the data was identified, the group created standards for each of the data elements as well as a list of valid values if applicable.

Is the basis for the standard identified, for example is this an existing standard, a modification of an existing standard or a new standard?

The Enterprise Human Resources Integration (EHRI) Program Office established over 550 data element standards for the HR, Payroll, and Training data. These standards are now published and maintained by the Strategic Human Resources Policy (SHRP) Division at OPM. All new data standards will be issued by SHRP based on new policy or business requirements.

The latest revision is Version 3.4 dated August 11, 2006.

Identification of participants:

Are the participating organizations identified? (Individual names may or may not be included in the draft.) No

Maintenance of the standard:

Is the maintenance authority for the standard identified?

These standards are now published and maintained by the Strategic Human Resources Policy (SHRP) Division at OPM. All new data standards will be issued by SHRP based on new policy or business requirements.

If a maintenance strategy is described, is it understandable and reasonable? Yes

Body of the standard:

Is the standard clearly organized and presented in an understandable manner? **Yes**

Does the standard follow a specific format guideline? **Yes**

References:

Is there a reference section? **No**

Are the references clearly identified so that someone can readily obtain them? **N/A**

Appendices/Annexes:

Is it clear whether these are informative (not part of what is being standardized) or normative (part of what is being standardized)? **No**

Legal considerations:

Have any patent assertions been made? **No**

If so, describe. **N/A**

Are there any IPR assertions that will hinder distribution of the approved standard? **No**

If so, describe. **N/A**

Other Issues:

How does the standard fit into the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA)? **The standard is consistent with the FEA.**

What mechanisms will be used to assess conformity of implementations to the standard? **Unknown**

What mechanisms will be used to assess the interoperability of different vendors' implementations? **Unknown**

Are any editorial corrections required? **No**

Does the standard reflect the requirements of the original project proposal? **Yes**

Is the standard independent of technology? **Yes**

Can the standard be implemented with known or future technology? **Yes**

Are there other similar standards available or are there other related standards development efforts going on? **No**

If so, are there overlap issues that need to be resolved, or is there a need to coordinate with other standards projects? **N/A**

Are there any questions that need to be answered or clarifications required before approval? **No**

Was there a public review? **No**

If so, was the public review based on a broad cross-section of users? **N/A**

In revising the standard, was the development group responsive to the comments received during the public review period? **N/A**

What has been done (i.e., due diligence) to establish that there is no available, suitable private sector consensus standard?

All of the EHRI data and image standards have been developed in collaboration with Federal subject matter experts and are designed to address specific Federal government requirements. While developing the standards, non-Federal entities, such as the HR XML Consortium, that were looking to standardize HR data were consulted. Their standards were adopted where possible.

Are there any appropriate private sector consensus standards developing organizations to which this standard should be submitted for further processing as a private sector consensus standard? **No**

If so, who will take responsibility for submitting the standard? **N/A**